



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

During all these years the party alignments of Virginia were largely though not exclusively based on the differences which nature had imposed. And these differences were sharply accentuated by the fact that the Scotch-Irish and German migrations to Virginia about the middle of the eighteenth century affected almost exclusively the up-country. And there was no great staple which, as in the lower South, could be grown in all Virginia and thus render her interests homogeneous. However, the sharp dispute about slavery which marked the first half of Mr. Ambler's period was in a fair way to final settlement when the Civil War came on. Slavery had made its impress on West Virginia; besides, the up-country had come to fear the free more than the slave. Western Virginians were quite content that slavery should prevail in the low-country, especially now that they had gained practical control of the legislature and had named the governors in every election; and they were increasing in population more rapidly than the east.

Throughout the book there is manifest an unbiassed and detached judgment, devotion to truth, and clear historical insight. It is refreshing to find a scion of one of Virginia's old families writing so frankly and freely about ante-bellum institutions in the South, witness the chapter on the Convention of 1829-1830 or the treatment of the struggle between the Methodist factions for control in northwestern Virginia.

It may not appear grateful to suggest even slight faults in a book which gives such satisfaction as does this, but it seems to the reviewer that closer attention to the Convention of 1776 might have revealed more about the contending forces—the failure of the Liberal leaders; and the author has not quite appreciated the rôle of Jefferson during the last dozen years of his life. However, these are minor matters. Professor Ambler has done well a rather difficult task. He has produced the best book on Virginia since the appearance of Philip Bruce's *Economic History* in 1896.

WILLIAM E. DODD.

*British Interests and Activities in Texas, 1838-1846.* By EPHRAIM DOUGLASS ADAMS, Ph.D., Professor of History in Leland Stanford Jr. University. [The Albert Shaw Lectures on Diplomatic History, 1909.] (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1910. Pp. viii, 267.)

THE title of this book sufficiently indicates its scope, except that most of the "activities" that it mentions took place at London, Mexico, and Paris—a fact, however, which does not lessen their importance. The narrative could easily have been made more readable; but the author did not choose to give himself that trouble in addition to all the rest of his labor, and the reviewer is not disposed to complain. On the other hand, the substance of the book cannot escape criticism, for it contains numerous errors, chargeable doubtless to no lack of ability or sound intentions

on the part of the author, but to want of time and to the narrowness of the field investigated—certain series of documents found in the Public Record Office, London. A few of the simple cases will indicate what is meant. Page 13: “at the time there was little question, save in extreme abolition circles, that the allegations of Calhoun [in his correspondence with Pakenham, touching British interference in Texas] had some foundation in fact”; but, as Calhoun merely asserted on that subject what Aberdeen had avowed, the foundation of his “allegations” was beyond question (*Sen. Doc. No. 341*, 28 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 50, 65). Page 20: “The records of the foreign office contain no trace whatever of this purported sale [of Texas to Englishmen] or of any similar scheme”; but the British minister reported a plan of the Mexican government to transfer Texas to England in his no. 48, July 1, 1836 (F. O., Mexico, XCIX.). Page 43: “Cañedo and his fellow-ministers . . . were deterred from advocating a policy that meant peace with Texas only by their fear of a popular uprising”; but Cañedo’s article in *La Revista Económica y Comercial de la República Mexicana* (January 15, 1844) shows that they did advocate such a plan. On page 61 the signing of the Anglo-Texan treaties is correctly stated to have taken place in 1840, but on page 93 this is placed among the events of 1842. Page 80: “throughout his career at the Mexican capital Pakenham very accurately reflected the attitude of the government at home”; but on page 123 he is said to have decided to take no action on certain definite instructions. Page 101: “Aberdeen . . . believed the United States destined to break up into separate states”; but his words (p. 102) were only that the Union “may in future times have separated” thus. On page 113 Professor Adams says: “up to November of 1842 no trace of any suggestion by British officials in authority that Texas abolish slavery is to be found.” This would be highly important, if true; but the envoy of Texas, reporting (January 5, 1838, Texas Archives) on his failure to secure British recognition, said that Palmerston had again brought up the question of slavery, and Palmerston himself remarked in the House of Commons, March 1, 1848 (*London Times*, March 2), that the government would have been “most delighted” to secure Abolition in Texas (as the price of recognition), but “could not obtain it”, which implies with considerable distinctness that such an attempt had been made. Page 131: Houston “argued most vigorously against Santa Anna’s proposal for an armistice”; but the British chargé wrote at this time (April 14, 1843) that Houston considered an armistice “indispensably necessary” (F. O., Texas, VI.). What he objected to was the idea that the armistice should be followed with an acknowledgment of Mexican sovereignty. On page 128 this plan is said to have resulted from Robinson’s obtaining an audience with Santa Anna and making certain representations to him; on page 133 the author says, “The plan had originated with Santa Anna”; and on page 229 we are told that it resulted from an Abolition meeting that occurred at London in June, 1843; whereas in fact it was definitely proposed

to Santa Anna by Robinson in a letter dated January 9, 1843 (a copy of which letter may be found in the Archives of the Texas Legation, State Department, Washington). On page 137 Professor Adams says that this plan "appeared upon the surface to tend toward the accomplishment of a permanent peace"; but on page 135 he more correctly remarks that it "seemed to lead up to an inevitable dead-lock". Page 138, note: "it has been impossible to determine with certainty which one of them [the Tappans] was received by Aberdeen"; but according to letters from England printed in the newspapers (*e. g.*, *New York Herald*, October 14, 1843; *Garrison's Liberator*, July 28, 1843) it was Lewis who went over to attend the Anti-Slavery Convention. On page 143 we find: "On November 16 Everett reported to Upshur:—" but what follows is really a very inaccurately quoted passage from Anson Jones (*Memoranda*, p. 82). Page 145: Aberdeen's note to Ashbel Smith "disclaimed any intention of interfering in Texan affairs"; but the note added the qualification "improperly", on which a world of meaning could hang. On page 147 Aberdeen is alleged to have "denied that British policy had gone farther [regarding slavery in Texas] than an expression of a philanthropic interest"; but he avowed openly (*Sen. Doc. No. 341*, 28 Cong., 1 sess., p. 49) that England was "constantly exerting herself" to bring about Abolition "throughout the world", and mentioned Texas particularly in that connection. Page 148: Elliot, the British chargé in Texas, is said to have been delighted with Aberdeen's despatch of July 31 to Doyle and much is built on this foundation; but in writing to Aberdeen (no. 28, September 30, 1843) he indicated that it was no. 10 which had pleased him, and no. 10 was dated July 1. Page 150: Upshur sent to Murphy "the contents" of the famous "Duff Green" letter. Would that he had; but Upshur stated that he sent only a "passage" (*Sen. Doc. No. 341*, 28 Cong., 1 sess., p. 18). The author explains (p. 152) that Elliot's "only comfort [on hearing that the United States had suggested annexation] lay in the non-committal attitude of Texas and the evident intention of Houston to postpone action"; but why did Elliot forget that (*e. g.*, p. 155) he believed Houston sincerely desired to prevent annexation? On page 160 Cowley's despatch of January 15, 1844, is said to be "the only despatch referring to the supposed protest to be found"; but Pakenham's no. 22, April 14, 1844 (F. O., America, CDIV.), shows that "a formal protest" against the annexation of Texas was authorized by the French government. In a note on page 201 we are informed that Elliot's reports confirm Jones's assertion (in his *Memoranda*) that he always represented the Texans as so determined upon joining the United States that any other result was very improbable; but this is certainly not the case (*e. g.*, Elliot, secret, December 28, 1844, F. O., Texas, IX.). On page 215, as elsewhere, the French chargé in Texas is named "Savigny", and he is said to have proceeded to Mexico on a certain highly important mission; but his name was "Saligny", and instead of undertaking such a mission, he went to New York at that

time (*Memphis Eagle*, April 23, 1845; *Charleston Courier*, April 29, 1845). On page 228 we are startled by the remark that Palmerston did not even "consider" the "possibility" of the annexation of Texas to the United States. In fact he intimated to the envoy of that country that, if she were going to join the American Union, an acknowledgment of her independence was unnecessary (Worley, in *Tex. Hist. Assoc. Quarterly*, IX. 4); and our minister to England reported (no. 4) on August 6, 1836, that the probability of the annexation of Texas was already perceived there (State Dept., Desps. from Mins., England, XLIV.). The author shows great freedom in imputing intentions to statesmen. On page 182 are two of these ascriptions, one of them labelled "undoubtedly" and the other "unquestionably", neither of which the reviewer can accept; and, in general, positiveness in presenting such inferences or conjectures appears a little out of place in a book described in its preface as "purely technical". The author's views regarding Elliot, the feeling of the northern Mexicans towards Texas, the reasons why Great Britain opposed our annexing that country, "Aberdeen's withdrawal from joint action with France", and several other matters, deserve an examination for which there is no space here. The foot-notes leave something to be desired. References that would be welcome are in numerous instances wanting; and despatches, though sometimes as many as eight or ten addressed to the same person bear the same date, are very seldom cited by number. A chapter on the annexation of California and an index of less than three pages conclude the volume.

JUSTIN H. SMITH.

*Charles Sumner.* By GEORGE H. HAYNES, Ph.D., Professor of History in the Worcester Polytechnic Institute. [*American Crisis Biographies.*] (Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs and Company. 1910. Pp. 469.)

THE series of *Crisis Biographies* would have been incomplete without a volume on Charles Sumner. This circumstance rather than any original inspiration seems to have called forth this new life of the Massachusetts statesman. It does not appear that the biographer has approached his task with any new material or with any new interpretation of Sumner's career. New material, indeed, could hardly be expected in view of the monumental work which Pierce erected to the memory of his hero. To the biographer of a later generation there are advantages and disadvantages in the pre-existence of a Boswell. While Professor Haynes has assembled his material carefully and has written a clear, readable narrative, he is nevertheless very much under the spell of Sumner's compelling personality. Sharing Sumner's hatred of the "barbarism of slavery" and predicating "inevitable" to the revolution which emancipated the slave, the biographer conceives Sumner in the rôle of